

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 7 are amended. New claims 11-22 are presented. Claims 1-22 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claim 1 is amended to correct an informality adding the term --and--.

Claim 7 is amended to recite that a collaboration apparatus between information processing systems includes role object generating means for generating role objects respectively corresponding to the information processing means that are allowed to collaborate with each other, and relating object generating means for referring to the collaboration information of the collaboration information storage means and generating a relating object for collaboration between the role objects. (See, for example, page 12, starting at line 11).

No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 11-22 present no new matter and are provided to afford a varying scope of protection.

New claims 11-13 and 17-19 recite a method, and a computer-readable storage storing a program, respectively, collaborating a plurality of information processors based on different architectures, including storing collaboration information among the plurality of information processors, generating role objects respectively corresponding to each of the information processors that are allowed to collaborate with each other, and referring to the stored collaboration information and generating a relating object for collaboration between the role objects. (See, for example, pages 11-12 starting at line 12).

New claims 14-16 and 20-22 recite a method, and a computer-readable storage storing a program, respectively, collaborating a plurality of information processors based on different architectures, respectively, including generating an information identification object that determines information to be stored in each of the plurality of information processors, storing collaboration information among the plurality of information processors, referring to the stored collaboration information and generating respective role objects of the information processor that are allowed to collaborate with each other, and referring to the stored collaboration information and generating a relating object for transmitting information to be stored in each of the information processors between the role objects. (See, for example, pages 18-19 starting at line 3).

No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the new claims are respectfully requested

ITEM 2: REJECTION OF CLAIM 7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) BY CROZIER (U.S.P. 5,666,553)

As provided in MPEP §706.02 entitled Rejection on Prior Art, anticipation requires that the reference must teach every aspect of a claimed invention. Crozier does not adequately support an anticipatory-type rejection by not describing features recited claim 7.

According to an aspect of the present invention a collaboration apparatus combines plurality of information processing systems regardless of differences in architecture into an integrated information processing system. According to an aspect of the present invention a use of objects includes that a processing of generating an object for collaboration between information processing means can be centralized at a collaboration apparatus between information processing systems. Therefore, if collaboration between information processing means is changed, and new information processing means is added, a correction of the collaboration apparatus between information processing systems is facilitated.

Crozier teaches a technique of converting data so as to enable data exchange between computers using different data formats, and enabling inconsistent data, if any, to be amended. (See, for example, col. 3, starting at line 7).

**Role Object Generating Means For Generating Role Objects Not Described
Relating Object Generating Means Not Described
Generating A Relating Object For Collaboration Between Role Objects Not Described**

Claim 7, as amended, recites an role object generating means for generating role objects respectively corresponding to the information processing means that are allowed to collaborate with each other and relating object generating means for referring to the collaboration information of the collaboration information storage means and generating a relating object for collaboration between the role objects. The use of the role objects and object collaboration facilitates integration and any required changes for integration.

Crozier does not describe, teach, or suggest object collaboration, let alone the features recited in claim 7, as amended. In fact, Crozier, does not use the term "object" at all. Further, in discussing claim 9, the Examiner concedes that "Crozier is silent" regarding the feature of generating a relating object for collaboration between the role objects. (Action at page 4).

Conclusion

Since Crozier does not describe features recited in claim 7 (as amended), claim 7 is patentable over the art and the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 7 allowed.

**ITEM 3: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6 AND 8-10 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C.
§103(a) OVER CROZIER IN VIEW OF BANAVAR (U.S.P. 6,425,016)**

***Prima Facie* Obviousness Not Established**

As provided in MPEP §2143.03 "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 1981, (CCPA 1974)."

Referring To Collaboration Information Among Plurality Of Information Processing Means Or Collaboration Information Storage Means Not Taught By Cited Art Alone Or In Combination

Independent claims 1 and 4 recite a collaboration apparatus including relating object generating means for referring to collaboration information of the collaboration information storage means. Independent claims 9 and 10 recite a collaboration program allowing a computer to execute processing of referring to collaboration information among a plurality of information processing means. The referring to collaboration information facilitates system integration and required corrections.

Neither Crozier or Banavar alone or in combination teach these features, nor does the Examiner contend the cited art teaches these features.

Real Communication, Delayed Batch Communication, And Batch Communication Not Taught By Cited Art

Dependent claims 3 and 6 recite that timing information is selected from a plurality of kinds of communication methods including real communication, delayed batch communication, and batch communication.

The Examiner contends these features are taught by Crozier col. 13, lines 5-67 and col. 15, lines 1-25. (Action at page 4).

However, Applicants submit that Crozier does not teach or suggest real communication, delayed batch communication, or batch communication in the cited lines or elsewhere. In fact, Crozier does not use these terms at all.

Conclusion

Since the cited art, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest features recited in the independent claims (and dependent claims), the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-6 and 8-10 allowed.

No Motivation Or Reasonable Expectation of Success Stated Within the Cited Art To Combine In The Manner Proposed By The Examiner

The Action concedes that Crozier does not teach generating role objects respectively corresponding to the information processing means, and generating a relating object for

collaboration between the role objects. (Action at page 4). The Action also concedes that "Crozier is silent" regarding features of:

information identification object generating means for generating an information identification object that determines information to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means.

(Action at page 5).

Nevertheless, the Examiner contends (Action at pages 4 and 5) that it would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Banavar regarding objects to Crozier "because it would have provided the capability for identifying the objects of the collaboration." (Action at page 5).

Applicants respectfully submit the Examiner's reasoning is incorrect since as previously pointed out Crozier does not teach features of an "object" at all. Applicants respectfully submit that such contentions by the Examiner are rejected by the USPTO as not satisfying the standards of *prima facie* obviousness necessary to support the combination of prior art references. (See, Memorandum of Stephen G. Kunin dated February 21, 2002 based on *Dickinson v. Zurko*, 527 U.S. 150, 50 USPQ 2d 1930 (1999), attached).

Conclusion

Since there is no motivation to combine the art in a manner suggested by the Examiner, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-6 and 8-10 allowed.

Summary

Since *prima facie* obviousness has not been established, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-6 and 8-10 allowed.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 11-13 and 17-19 recite a method, and a computer-readable storage storing a program, respectively, collaborating a plurality of information processors based on different architectures, including storing collaboration information among the plurality of information processors, generating role objects respectively corresponding each of the information processors that are allowed to collaborate with each other, and referring to the stored collaboration information and generating a relating object for collaboration between the role objects.

New claims 14-16 and 20-22 recite a method, and a computer-readable storage storing a program, respectively, collaborating a plurality of information processors based on different architectures, respectively, including generating an information identification object that determines information to be stored in each of the plurality of information processors, storing collaboration information among the plurality of information processors, referring to the stored

collaboration information and generating respective role objects of the information processor that are allowed to collaborate with each other, and referring to the stored collaboration information and generating a relating object for transmitting information to be stored in each of the information processors between the role objects.

These, and other, features of claims 14-22 are patentably distinguishable from the cited art, and they are submitted to be allowable for the recitations therein.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 17, 2004

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501